DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 353 884 HE 026 139

AUTHOR Slevin, James F.
TITLE The Next Generation: Preparing Graduate Students for the Professional Responsibilities of College Teachers.
INSTITUTION Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-911696-58-X
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 37p.
AVAILABLE FROM Association of American Colleges, 1818 R Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20009 ($14).
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; Cooperation; *Educational Change; General Education; *Graduate Students; Higher Education; Humanities; *Professional Development; Seminars; *Student Participation; *Teacher Education; Teacher Responsibility; *Teacher Student Relationship; Teaching Assistants; Teaching Experience; Teaching Models

ABSTRACT

This monograph presents results and recommendations from a project designed as a collaborative effort to prepare graduate students in the humanities for careers as scholar-teachers within institutions committed to liberal education. The project's two principle activities are discussed under the following headings: (1) Encountering Campus Cultures: Discovering the Responsibilities of College Teachers; and (2) Seminars: Reflecting on the Responsibilities of College Teachers. The first of these activities involved the Teaching Fellows in campus visits during which they attended department and faculty meetings, observed and sometimes taught classes, and met with individual faculty members who assumed mentoring roles and with whom every aspect of the campus, cultural, career and professional life of the college teacher could be explored. The second activity provides the Teaching Fellows with an opportunity to reflect on what they learned at the colleges and involves two kinds of seminar: (1) the core seminar, which brings the experience of contact/encounter into the structure of graduate training; and (2) the disciplinary seminar, which focuses on the connection between scholarly work and teaching, helps prepare the graduate students within their disciplines, and serves as a means of reimagining and restructuring the graduate programs themselves. Findings show that doctoral students, if given the chance, are eager to engage in the work of academic leadership, even at the beginning of their careers and that a major factor in enhancing their willingness to assume an active role is their encounters with college faculty members. Several recommendations are offered and discussed for future consideration. These are: (1) that coalitions should be built to promote reform; (2) that graduate training must include preparation for the full range of professional responsibilities, especially teaching; (3) that support and incentives should be built for participation of graduate educators in these reform efforts; and (4) that alternative, especially collaborative, models should be developed for improving graduate preparation. (GLR)

ED353884

THE NEXT GENERATION

PREPARING GRADUATE STUDENTS FOR THE PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF COLLEGE TEACHERS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE 026 139

HC

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AAC

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

THE NEXT GENERATION

PREPARING GRADUATE STUDENTS FOR THE PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF COLLEGE TEACHERS

JAMES F. SLEVIN
PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES, 1992

THIS WORK WAS SUPPORTED BY
THE FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT
OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION,
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Published by
Association of American Colleges
1818 R Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009

Copyright 1992

ISBN 0-911696-58-X

> What no one is preparing graduate students for is life as a faculty member. This life, which may be more compelling at colleges than at universities, requires graduate students to identify themselves not just with their disciplines but with other faculty. I think the widespread lack of understanding of the values of academic life and of the struggles by faculty that have made academic communities different from other communities of workers has put those values and those communities in jeopardy. The teaching mission is, in my view, sustained by the academic world we create as its setting.
>
> Janet Gezari, Professor of English, Connecticut College

For many years—and increasingly in the last decade—there have been calls for reform in the preparation of graduate students for careers in college-level teaching. Administrators and faculty members at institutions committed to undergraduate education have urged this reform for the sake of their undergraduate students. Graduate students themselves have regularly demanded it, consonant with their desire to become the good teachers that students deserve. Many concerned faculty members at Ph.D.-granting institutions have sought reform as well and look for guidance and support in their efforts to change graduate programs of study.

The Association of American Colleges has responded to these concerns. With a grant from the U.S. Department of Education's Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, AAC created a project designed to explore alternatives to current practices and foster cooperation between graduate schools and teaching institutions that can better serve the missions of both. This project, answering calls for change and replacing sterile acrimony with fruitful collaboration, can serve as a model for continuing efforts to prepare graduate students for their professional responsibilities as college teachers.

THE PROBLEM

From their graduate study, new faculty members have learned to contribute significantly to research in their disciplines; that they have learned this

For all their skills as scholars, new faculty members have learned virtually nothing about the values of academic life

well, and begin their careers committed to their scholarship, is not in itself a problem. As Janet Gezari—a participant in AAC's project—observes, however, much has been left unconsidered during graduate school. This college teacher reminds us that, for all their skills as scholars, new faculty members have learned virtually nothing about "the values of academic life" and the special qualities of "academic communities"—in short, about "life as a faculty member." Those who care about undergraduate education, she insists, need to care as well about how deeply and comprehensively new faculty members are helped to understand the institutional structures and commitments of academic communities and their power to sustain higher education's teaching mission. That mission and the sense of community that serves as its foundation are now, in her words, in jeopardy.

Increasing scholarly specialization and professionalization mark current graduate programs in unprecedented ways. The proposal establishing the AAC project put the matter this way:

> In most graduate institutions the intense focus on training graduate students to become specialized research scholars continues to crowd out any systematic effort to prepare them to become effective teachers or to assume many other tasks that attend a faculty appointment.

Inevitably, given these emphases, graduate students expect their most supportive and nourishing community to be the discipline in which they seek to make their scholarly contribution. This allegiance is not wrong but narrow: It closes off other arenas to which graduate students may contribute and from which they may find nurture, and it unnecessarily limits the sense of community loyalties they can develop.

The problem affects the next generation of faculty members both during graduate school and beyond. The nearly exclusive focus of graduate study on research does not merely neglect graduate students' commitment to teaching and their desire to become good teachers; it actively discourages that commitment. Teaching is rarely discussed and even more rarely presented as a vital part of their preparation for their careers. All too often, teaching is treated instead as a necessary evil—a means for graduate students to earn a meager subsistence while preparing to do scholarship. These values are internalized and shape graduate students' expectations.

Those expectations hardly match the actual work that their careers will require, at least at those institutions that take undergraduate teaching as their primary mission. As a result, most arrive at these institutions unprepared to design and teach their own courses—even courses in their area of specialization. Only a few new Ph.D.s have had occasion to do that; even fewer have received any guidance in how to do it well. Barely prepared to teach their specialties, they often are completely unprepared to assume the common obligations of general-education requirements.

Meanwhile, as they scramble to come up to speed as teachers, they encounter other obligations (like committee work and student advising) that seem distracting, even burdensome. Then, unwilling to ignore their teaching and service, many new faculty members let their scholarship slide. Most find it difficult to integrate the various roles they are asked to play—as scholars, teachers, and responsible citizens in the college community.

Undergraduate institutions, and particularly their students, thereby suffer. In general, *learning* suffers: not only students' learning but also the "learning" that is the mission of scholarship. As new faculty members struggle to keep up with the many new responsibilities for which they have *not* been prepared, the scholarly contribution they *have* been prepared to make is delayed, sidetracked, or, even worse, rushed. That is the final irony: The work these young faculty members are best prepared to do—their research—often cannot be done well.

To the extent that scholarship enriches teaching, that teaching is now less rich than it could be. To the extent that department colleagues are renewed by the new perspectives of recent Ph.D.s, that renewal is frustrated. To the extent that graduate programs devote themselves to preparing productive scholars, the very narrowness of that preparation proves self-defeating. This state of affairs serves no one well. It is in everyone's interest to find alternative ways of preparing graduate students for life in the academy.

THE PROJECT

Rather than simply continue the polarizing accusations that now pass for "dialogue," AAC's project—Preparing Graduate Students for the Professional Responsibilities of College Teachers—brought together graduate school professors, doctoral students, and teachers of undergraduates in liberal arts colleges in a collaborative effort to prepare graduate students in the humanities for careers as scholar-teachers in institutions committed to liberal education. In the proposal that initiated and guided this project, AAC envisioned fairly dramatic reform:

> The immediate objective of this project is the creation of a group of programs, rooted in particular disciplines, which prepare graduate students for careers in college teaching and help them develop a broader and deeper understanding of the whole range of responsibilities that scholars assume when they become part of the faculty of institutions that take seriously the ideals of liberal education. The long-term objective is to create an effective and efficient approach to the work of preparation for college teaching that will have impact beyond its initial sites.

The project involved three pairs of graduate universities and colleges: Duke University and Guilford College; Brown University and Connecticut College; and (for 1990–91 only) the University of Chicago and Knox College. Selected graduate students from departments of history, English, classics, religious studies, political science, philosophy, and psychology were identified as "AAC Teaching Fellows." These Teaching Fellows participated in two kinds of activities.

First, in seminars sponsored at their graduate school, they studied and discussed all phases of life in higher education. A core seminar considered questions of teaching, learning, and the responsibilities of faculty members; a department seminar examined specific curricular and pedagogical issues from the perspective of that particular discipline.

Second, the Teaching Fellows were offered intensive experiences on the campus of the liberal arts college. They visited and even taught classes, attended faculty and department meetings, and met students and

faculty members, gaining practical experience under the guidance of a faculty mentor in their discipline. Through these experiences, they were able to encounter and question campus cultures that sharply contrast with the research-university cultures that currently define their values and aspirations.

ENCOUNTERING CAMPUS CULTURES: DISCOVERING THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF COLLEGE TEACHERS

The metaphor at work here—the critical encounter with colleges as discernible and explainable "cultures"—illuminates one dimension of what is needed to improve the preparation of new faculty members. Graduate students should have opportunities to encounter other academic cultures and through these experiences arrive at a better understanding of their variety. To make informed career choices, they need exposure to different types of institutions that have different histories and educational missions; different forms of governance; different procedures for rewarding achievement; and different relations of faculty members to students, to administrators, to departmental colleagues, and to other faculty members. They deserve a chance to learn first-hand, with an experienced faculty mentor as their guide, how a campus is a complex system of overt and hidden rules, means of exchange, taboos, and often mystifying rituals of contact and avoidance.

The general aim of this project has been to make graduate students aware of a variety of these cultures and the broad range of responsibilities they will assume as faculty members. Its specific aim has been to offer an intensive introduction to, and experience of, the liberal arts college as one type of campus culture. At all three sites, Teaching Fellows regularly visited the campuses of the liberal arts college. Sometimes these visits were formally arranged; at other times they were more casual, arranged by faculty members and graduate students who had first met one another during the more formal visits. Because efforts were made to create a collegial atmosphere, many successful individual mentoring relationships were established. Nearly all the Teaching Fellows made at least two or three (in

'The everyday work of a faculty member consists not only in teaching and research but in helping define institutionally what learning is, how it takes place, and who is hired to do it'

some cases five and six) visits to the college campus—sometimes individually, occasionally in groups—and gained exposure to the life of the campus. They attended department meetings and meetings of the entire faculty; they observed, and sometimes later taught, classes; and they met with individual faculty members who assumed the role of mentor, talking at length about scholarship, teaching, the life of the campus, and the life of the profession.

The visits could be quite intensive. One three-day visit to Knox began with a social gathering, the next two days were taken up with classroom experiences, mock interviews with a dean, discussions with undergraduate students, and panel discussions. Less formal encounters also were available: The opening meeting at Connecticut College began with a dinner conversation and included class visits and teaching, department meetings, and attendance with faculty members at extracurricular events.

An astonishing level of mutual respect and collegial rapport was evident at all three sites. As one Teaching Fellow put it, these experiences were "like going to a conference; people took me seriously without being my teacher. The difference is that we talked about teaching, not my [scholarly] 'project.' It was great being taken for an adult. It was inspiring just to get to know these other teachers, as other teachers."

The Teaching Fellows very quickly came to admire the college faculty members, both as individuals and for their efforts as mentors. Another Teaching Fellow's report on his experiences at Connecticut College is typical:

> I made several trips to Connecticut College. I met with my mentor... observed one of his lectures, discussed with him how he prepared for classes, his own impressions of what it has been like to be a young faculty member, the pressures of teaching and doing research and having a wife and a family...trying to get a dissertation published, the rat-race job market, and doing dissertation research in Germany (as I will myself next year). [My mentor] is also very personable and a pleasure to have met. He has done a great deal to demythologize all of this.

Like this one, the most successful mentoring relationships developed around shared professional and scholarly—as well as pedagogical—concerns. Teaching Fellows visited meeting rooms, faculty lounges, even library carrels, as well as classrooms. They and their faculty mentors discussed research and publishing, careers and job markets, hiring and firing, campus politics, and even the latest local battle in the "culture wars," as well as teaching.

All too easily, the cultural norms of the liberal arts college are talked about in terms of, and so limited to, "teaching." It's a legitimate emphasis, to be sure, but it needs to be probed and its full meaning explored. That probing and exploration yield a far more nuanced response to the question, What does it mean—and what can it mean—to be a "college teacher"? It includes not simply classroom performance (though effective ways of being in a classroom are certainly important) but also the complex intersection of the faculty member's scholarly/professional life, collegiality, commitment to his or her institution's governance, and nurturing relationship to students that goes far beyond the experience of the classroom or the single course. One Teaching Fellow at Brown came to understand it this way:

> These meetings helped me realize that the everyday work of a faculty member consists not only in teaching and research but in helping define institutionally what learning is, how it takes place, and who is hired to do it. This work is hardly glamorous and is not rewarded monetarily, but it is absolutely crucial to the validity of the institution and to the constituents it serves.

To be a "college teacher"—as it has been understood and actually experienced by the Teaching Fellows participating in this project—means reconfiguring the academic life and thereby the academy, enriching its possibilities and integrating a faculty member's work. The project has promoted a much-needed rethinking of what it means to be a college teacher and has even sought better to understand, perhaps to renew, the possibilities of the title itself.

In this regard, the AAC project has made it possible for young professionals to imagine an alternative to the narrow and fragmented vision of the academy that graduate education currently affords. The project's aim

has not been to insist upon this alternative vision but simply to make it available, to provide Teaching Fellows with a more comprehensive view of the opportunities that different campus cultures afford them. In helping to raise and begin to answer fundamental questions about higher education, the project has enabled the AAC Teaching Fellows to begin whatever career path they choose knowing, perhaps deciding to live out, the ideals of liberal learning that they encountered at the liberal arts college.

SEMINARS: REFLECTING ON THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF COLLEGE TEACHERS

What graduate students learn from their campus visits can contribute enormously to how they prepare themselves for their careers. Providing these opportunities clearly is a crucial feature of any effort to reform graduate education. There are limits, however, to what this experience by itself can achieve. If the campus contact is not integrated into graduate study itself—if it remains entirely outside the structure of graduate programs—then the segregation of teaching from scholarship may be reinforced rather than challenged. Activities that bring the two together— that make the issues considered and experiences provided on the college campus part of the graduate program—deepen graduate students' understanding of the key issues and so improve their preparation. Moreover, they exert pressure for reform on the graduate program itself by providing an alternative model for what graduate education should and can become.

For that reason, the "campus contact" in the AAC project has been envisioned from the very beginning as a two-way street, affording Teaching Fellows back on their own campuses the opportunity to reflect on what they have learned at the colleges. Moreover, two kinds of seminars are needed in order to address the full range of faculty responsibilities. One is specific to individual disciplines, while the other—the "core" seminar—is more inclusive, embracing concerns that transcend, even as they permeate, particular disciplines.

The core seminar. A core seminar provides opportunities to reconceive graduate education in a general way and explore topics that cut

across disciplinary specialties. It brings together faculty members and graduate students from all disciplines to discuss issues of general concern. The core seminar brings the experience of contact/encounter into the structure of graduate training. As a result, the experience of campus contact is not just an extracurricular foray but a recognized part of graduate education and a force to alter the structure of that education—a vehicle for change.

How it can serve that purpose can be illustrated by the core seminar at the Duke/Guilford site. The seminar was built around a series of articles collected in *The Academic's Handbook* (edited by Leigh DeNeef, associate dean of Duke's Graduate School and campus coordinator for the AAC project). Its topics served to structure a series of dinner meetings, held alternately at Duke and Guilford, for all program participants. Each topic embraced complex questions, understood as questions with multiple and often competing answers:

- What are the implications of the changing institutional and demographic profile of American higher education? What are some of the resources, and some of the limitations, in responding to the needs of underprepared students?
- What are some of the new directions of undergraduate humanities curricula?
- What do we know, and what don't we know, about how students learn? What is the nature of—and what are possible relationships among—different methods of instruction (lecture, discussion, collaborative learning)?
- What are the college's responsibilities in counseling and advising students?
- What are the power relationships at play in encounters between students and faculty members? How do we deal with questions of harassment and equity?
- How do faculty members find the time and the resources for research and scholarship? How are teaching and scholarship connected? Disconnected? What is the faculty member's role in institutional governance?

At many graduate institutions, faculty members find in projects like this one the occasion and even the incentive to improve the preparation of their students

- What is the system of rewards in the academy? How does the hiring market work, and why does everyone call it a "market"? How is tenure awarded, and for what? How else is one rewarded? Unrewarded?

The meetings were restricted to those formally participating in the project (including the active and regular participation of Guilford faculty members), so that spirited discussion of these issues could be assured. The careful planning, and the restrictions on attendance, made for continuity in theme and conversation, providing all the Teaching Fellows and faculty members ample opportunity to be heard.

A seminar such as this one, integrated into the graduate program of studies, permits graduate students not just to anticipate but to prepare themselves for the wide-ranging responsibilities they soon will encounter. Graduate study thus becomes, as it must, more inclusive. More issues are examined, more questions are raised, and more voices are heard—particularly the voices of college faculty members who provide a perspective that graduate education sorely needs.

The disciplinary seminar. The benefits of this interaction—the merging of experiences on the college campuses with formal seminars in the graduate programs—is perhaps even better illustrated by the second kind of seminar, the disciplinary seminar. Here too, the role played by faculty members from the liberal arts colleges is crucial and contributes to the re-forming of graduate education itself. Drawing these faculty mentors into the seminars, hearing their perspectives on the connections between scholarly work and teaching, both improves and legitimizes these considerations.

One of the teachers that the Brown Teaching Fellows met through their visits to Connecticut College was English professor Julie Rivkin. They watched her teach her class; later, she observed them teaching the same class. Their conversations included, naturally, discussions about new directions in English studies, about Rivkin's scholarship and the Teaching Fellows' dissertations, and about how her work in the classroom rests within a rich life in research, service, and collegial exchange.

These conversations were not limited to the Connecticut College campus, however. At the end of the academic year, Rivkin presented a

paper and led a discussion for about fifteen graduate students and several faculty members in the English department seminar room at Brown. A conversation begun at Connecticut College—concerned particularly with Rivkin's effort to devise a literary theory course for her college's English majors—became the concluding session in a series of seminar meetings for Teaching Fellows and faculty members in English at Brown.

This series included presentations by Wayne Booth, Pullman Professor of English and former provost at the University of Chicago, and by professors Neil Lazarus and George Landow of Brown. Another meeting, with Robert Scholes of Brown, concerned "The Graduate Curriculum and Responses to Change: Pedagogy and Theory." At a later session, Paul Lauter, professor of English at Trinity College, spoke about teaching American literature as a multicultural literature.

By sponsoring this continuing conversation, the project had altered in significant ways what was considered "acceptable" to expect in a graduate seminar. Discussions of curricular and pedagogical issues, usually strangers in the realm of doctoral programs, seemed quite at home there. It is important to emphasize that this was not an "incursion" resisted by graduate professors. At many graduate institutions, faculty members like Brown's Scholes, Lazarus, and Landow find in projects like this one the occasion and even the incentive to improve the preparation of their students. There are friends of change in graduate schools, and many of them have been trying for a long time—without any outside support or encouragement—to effect change.

Brown's history department offers an example. Professor John Thomas had urged for many years that the department sponsor graduate seminars in teaching; the AAC project made it possible. The details of the seminar and the larger implications of its implementation are conveyed in this letter from Lyde Sizer, a Teaching Fellow from Brown's history department.

> Our subject-specific seminar focused on the mundane but absolutely necessary building blocks of teaching history: construction of a syllabus, use of textbooks, construction and purposes of lecturing, grading and analysis of student papers, and two general meetings—

> one planning, one primarily social. By the end of the semester the seminar had served all kinds of collateral uses: We had become a mini-community...and established intellectual relationships based on teaching that I imagine will continue to buttress our teaching—particularly when we have problems and need some feedback.

Since no course of this kind had ever been offered in Lyde's department, her enthusiasm for it was quite understandable. There is no doubt that the Teaching Fellows came away from these seminars with a new sense of what a career in their field means—or, rather, can be made to mean. Moreover, while the disciplinary seminars help to prepare the graduate students within their disciplines, they also serve as a site for reimagining and restructuring the graduate programs themselves. Indeed, Brown's disciplinary seminar in history has become a regular part of the department's graduate offerings.

The conversations in these seminars look in two directions: outward, toward the future professional careers that the graduate students will embrace; and inward, toward the structure and aims of graduate education itself. Two futures are thus imagined: a life in the academic discipline for each graduate student and perhaps a new life for the graduate department, a new way of conceiving of the Ph.D. that more adequately serves higher education in our time.

FINDINGS

At present, two generalizations characterize the process of faculty preparation.

- First, graduate education is something that happens to graduate students.
- Second, the arrival on campus of inexperienced—in many ways unprepared—faculty members is something that happens to colleges and universities.

This passivity is harmful; change is both desirable and possible. Graduate students and college educators can take a more active role.

In fact, this project suggests that doctoral students are anxious to have a voice in shaping their graduate programs; many college faculty members are eager to listen to graduate students and to respond, voicing what they know about life in the academy. The problem for higher education is to find ways to facilitate this active dialogue. The model provided by the AAC project illustrates how this can be done and why it needs to be done.

Finding a voice in a "culture of silence." The initiatives taken by AAC Teaching Fellows themselves make clear that, given the chance, graduate students are eager to engage in the work of academic leadership, even at the beginning of their careers. They already have something to say about their own education, and they want very much to be heard. Too often, they feel they are not.

Duke Teaching Fellow Susan Mulvey, noting that she gained both information and insight about teaching from the Guilford faculty, emphasizes, "While my questions about teaching could no doubt have been answered by faculty within my department at Duke, issues related to teaching are rarely openly discussed within the department and the prospect of approaching a Duke faculty member was somewhat intimidating." Her colleague, Zoe Warwick, makes a similar point, remarking that her real love of teaching made her feel somewhat anomalous in her department. For these students, the opportunities at Guilford constituted a break in the silence about teaching that marked their graduate school experience.

The Teaching Fellows expressed almost universally a sense of "invigoration" and "joy" in finding at the colleges so many who shared their own interest in teaching. They also noted that the visits promoted valuable conversations among themselves—conversations that otherwise would not have occurred.

Kathryn West's appraisal of her experience in the project reveals some basic inadequacies of current graduate programs and points to the kind of change that is needed:

> Just "talking"—to Duke and Guilford faculty, to other Duke graduate students, to Guilford undergraduates—was invaluable, whether it was a situation in which there was a planned topic or a more informal

'[The project] reminded me of why I went to graduate school in the first place: to learn to teach as well as my undergraduate professors had'

chat.... This type of program is particularly constructive in helping to overcome what I would call "institutional embarrassment" about certain issues. For instance...people do not seem to feel comfortable about teaching, about what really happens in the classroom, about what they feel unsure of there, or even what they feel good about there.... A program like this provides the institutional sanction for getting some of those things out in the open.

What Kathryn calls the "institutional embarrassment" that accompanies talk about teaching in graduate school points to what another Teaching Fellow characterized as "a culture of silence." Within that culture, many graduate students feel a good deal of anxiety when they ponder their own motives and wonder if their personal goals—to teach as well as publish, to do all the work of educating that marks a professor's actual life—might seem "peculiar" to others. Though they don't often have occasion to give voice to this view, nearly all the graduate students participating in this project—admittedly, a self-selecting group—entered their degree programs to become themselves some version of their best undergraduate teachers. They did not know at the time quite what such a life was like, for so much of it is concealed from students, at every level. But they knew and felt the importance of that life—its value to them and its value to their teachers—and they wanted it. Colleen Seguin, a graduate student in history at Duke, expresses it this way:

> I found it extremely valuable to sit in on classes and a faculty meeting at Guilford. It brought to mind my own undergraduate experience at a small liberal arts college and reminded me of why I went to graduate school in the first place (i.e., to learn to teach as well as my undergraduate professors had). The negative attitude among Duke faculty about teaching was notably absent at Guilford.

If there is one theme repeated in the Teaching Fellows' stories, it is a sense of both renewed enthusiasm for their careers—often expressed as a recovery of original motives—and a far more realistic (though not, for all that, more daunting) sense of the manifold responsibilities that await them. Above all, there is a gratitude for the opportunity to talk—more exactly, *to*

be heard—about these matters. One of the project's enduring contributions is that Teaching Fellows will be willing to continue with new colleagues and with their own students the conversations about teaching and service and scholarship that occurred at the liberal arts colleges, in the seminars sponsored at the graduate schools, in the graduate student lounges, in coffee rooms, and even in cars on long commutes between campuses. There will be less silence; the Teaching Fellows will help to promote not just more but better talk about the work faculty members do.

That is not earth-shattering, but it is a significant change—and it is a change that more graduate students, at more universities, need the opportunity to experience. The most encouraging sign that such change will be welcomed is the effort graduate students themselves made to shape and stir this project. Teaching Fellows often took the most active role in arranging activities, and their enthusiasm was in no small measure responsible for—the cause of—the faculty's participation. We miss the point of this project if we don't recognize that at least in some measure the graduate students themselves helped to fashion it: seeking out individual mentoring, organizing discussion groups, inviting faculty members to join in their conversations. They need and deserve more opportunities to create for themselves the appropriate preparation for their future work.

Part of that work will be academic leadership—a very significant "professional responsibility of college teachers" that has virtually no standing in prevailing notions of graduate study. The term "service" covers a host of duties, but genuine innovation and leadership rarely are included or are included not as an ideal but as a wondrous exception. If teaching is slighted in graduate preparation, the ideal of professional service and leadership is ignored outright. It need not be this way; we can learn from the AAC project how responsibly and vigorously graduate students—given the opportunity—can provide innovative leadership.

Finding new voices to combat the culture of silence. The ability of Teaching Fellows to take this active role was enhanced in no small measure by their encounters with the college faculty members. What the college faculty members gained from this encounter was the realization that they have much to contribute to graduate students and that they want to

be involved in that process. Behind this realization rests the assumption that liberal arts colleges—and all colleges with a primary commitment to undergraduate teaching—have motive to intervene in the preparation of their future colleagues. Indeed, they have more than motive; they have a right and perhaps even an obligation.

While there is discontent with the preparation that new faculty members are receiving, there is no comparable initiative to alter it apart from the usual laments and the makeshift orientation and faculty-development programs initiated on college campuses. This comes too late: *Faculty development begins in graduate school*—whether we like it or not. The future professoriat is developed in its habits and sense of priorities during graduate studies. If we wonder why scholarship seems to outweigh teaching and service in the collective mind of the academy, we should consider first the relative importance assigned to each within graduate programs of study: Change that structure of significance and you change a generation of new faculty members. Many liberal arts college faculty members are committed to assisting this change.

Their motives are not entirely altruistic, though they are that. After all, a project like this one, designed primarily to influence and assist graduate students and secondarily to improve the graduate programs that prepare them, seems only tangentially and rarely to profit the particular colleges involved. Much work was asked of the faculty members there, for little reward and at great expense of time and energy. Their commitment to the project added just another weight to their already overburdened schedules; they participated nevertheless, actively and enthusiastically.

The question for them, and for higher education generally, is not whether these gifted scholar/teachers should be involved in preparing graduate students but rather how to create programs that make their involvement beneficial to them, that make it worth their while. From their own evaluations of the project come insights that constitute substantial recommendations for structuring future efforts of this kind.

For example, at each participating site, arrangements were made so that college faculty members would receive from the research university library privileges, access to computer data bases, and opportunities to use

other aids to research and teaching. These were most welcome, as were occasions to participate in various other ways—lectures, workshops, and so forth—in the life of the university. Such arrangements are absolutely necessary.

Other less tangible but perhaps more significant benefits derive from the atmosphere of collegiality that marked encounters with graduate school faculty members and students. Like all good teachers, the college faculty members knew how to learn, and in addition to giving much to the project it is clear that they gained much as well. There was, for example, the pleasure of finding another way of "keeping up." Many cited the value of having ongoing conversations with Teaching Fellows doing research in their particular field—what one participant called "the opportunity to find out what's happening in graduate school these days." Another emphasized that "The great plus is that [the project] puts one in touch with what the coming generation of young scholars is up to. This is especially valuable for members of a small college with no serious graduate program of its own." What these comments suggest is that a project like this one can be a significant dimension of "faculty development" (in all its phases) at liberal arts colleges.

Even teaching can benefit. One participant noted, "What's in it for faculty is contact with new ways of teaching, of thinking about new critical material and approaches to texts we haven't thought of, or used." A Guilford historian went a step further: "This program has been very helpful for my teaching and also for my department as a whole. [It has] led us at Guilford to examine the way that we organize the major. We plan to continue this examination as a department." Elaborating on this very positive contribution, with particular attention to the struggle of values at work in discussions of "good teaching," Elinor Despalatovic, from Connecticut College's history department, pointed to some fundamental benefits: "The visits and seminars promoted more discussion of good teaching at the college. This is a very sensitive issue now when evaluation and talk about accountability are on the increase. The project added to and actually improved this discussion—it became more serious and more complex."

In short, faculty mentors were grateful for the chance to participate

in the project. But it really is the academy, broadly conceived, that should be grateful. The participation of these faculty members makes clear that higher education, especially graduate education, has available a previously untapped resource that is certainly ready, generally willing, and in most cases even eager to help out. To enlist their help, however, we need to rethink seriously what it means to "contribute to the profession"—a phrase usually associated, indeed often exclusively associated, with publication. Most liberal arts faculty members already make such contributions as scholars active in their fields. But there are clearly other sorts of contributions needed now—contributions to the development of the future professoriat—that it is our responsibility to understand, cultivate, and reward. The development of adequately supported and mutually beneficial collaborations between graduate and undergraduate institutions is a step toward securing this contribution and so assuring a better prepared and more committed new generation of college teachers.

RECOMMENDATIONS: WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

In considering the impact of this project, one is reminded of the influence that the Danforth Foundation had on a whole generation of Danforth Fellows—an influence that has deeply shaped their commitments as college teachers. Danforth helped them to think seriously about their futures not just as scholars but as teachers and campus leaders and thereby encouraged them to see their academic lives "whole" and to think about how teaching would play an integral and intellectually vital part in their careers.

The AAC project these past two years made a comparable contribution. It inserted into the socializing process of graduate education an alternative vision that enabled graduate students to rethink the "possibilities" currently made available to them. Higher education deeply needs such an influence. We have lost sight of this aspect of our mission in preparing graduate students, and a project like this one can serve as one way to bring it back—to give it renewed vigor and the kind of institutional endorsement so necessary to those seeking change. The conversations that have gone on at these campuses—the way teaching and scholarship and

academic responsibilities have been talked about—have made a difference and could make a difference at many other schools, graduate and undergraduate. They could mark the beginning, and be the heart, of a significant reform that incorporates, among others, the following initiatives.

Building coalitions for reform: It is clear that change will depend on a concerted effort by many different areas within higher education to identify problems and experiment with different solutions. At least five different groups should join forces to consider and implement change.

- First, graduate schools and departments must rethink what they are doing to meet the needs of the institutions and students their new Ph.D.s eventually will be called upon to serve. In particular, research universities must reconsider the support and reward they accord to those of their faculty members who are working to achieve this better preparation. The Council of Graduate Schools can and should play a leading role in stimulating these considerations.
- Second, we must find ways to involve graduate students themselves, helping them to take a more active role in assuring that they are being prepared for the kind of career they want.
- Third, faculty members and administrators at liberal arts colleges (and, more generally, educators at all institutions who receive the "products" of graduate education) should recognize their responsibility to influence graduate programs, to support and even initiate projects that improve how new faculty members are prepared by their graduate education.
- Fourth, professional associations representing all disciplines—in the humanities, sciences, and social sciences—ought to get involved. They should recognize and study the diversity of the professoriat in their fields and the wide range of institutional types their members serve. They should open up dialogues about the different needs and interests of their discipline and among association members from different kinds of institutions. They also should strive to specify standards of good practice in preparing graduate

students for their work as scholars, teachers, and "good citizens" of colleges and universities.

- Finally, funding agencies that have been especially supportive of improving graduate education (on the one hand) and enhancing faculty-development programs (on the other hand) must remember that these hands are attached to the same body and that faculty development begins in graduate school.

The AAC project offers one avenue to reform; it provides a model that can be turned to new, more comprehensive initiatives for change. Indeed, by providing the point of departure for our collective consideration, it has already achieved something eminently worthwhile.

Graduate training must include preparation for the full range of professorial responsibilities, especially teaching. Perhaps the point on which all participants in this project most strongly agree is the need for better preparation of graduate students as teachers. Faculty members and administrators at the liberal arts colleges regularly decried the absence of this preparation, and concerned graduate faculty members themselves not only acknowledged the deficiency but even welcomed the criticism as leverage to promote curricular change.

Graduate students have every right to be concerned about the range of courses they get to teach and the range of responsibilities they are allowed to assume in those courses. While there are some variations among different disciplines and institutions, graduate students generally get very little help in preparing to teach. To be ready for the careers that await them, they need careful guidance through a sequence of teaching experiences. Carefully mentored teaching opportunities—like the opportunities provided by the AAC project—must be incorporated into graduate programs, and these opportunities should cover the full range of courses that new faculty members will be expected to handle. That includes courses that contribute to general-education programs, introductory courses in the major, and more specialized courses. They need help in preparing for all these courses, and in particular they deserve the opportunity—now almost universally denied them—to teach more advanced courses to majors.

The AAC Teaching Fellows, from their experiences at the campuses of the liberal arts colleges, drew these same conclusions—unanimously. Like the faculty members at the colleges, they also were unanimous in calling for changes in the graduate curriculum to require seminars in the art of teaching. Here, too, the innovations created through the AAC project can offer some guidance. The department seminars, conceived as collaborations among faculty members and Teaching Fellows, provided occasions for penetrating and far-reaching discussions, especially when they included reflections on the experiences at the liberal arts colleges and invited the participation of faculty members from those colleges.

Graduate departments should incorporate such seminars into their curricula, for it is through their experience in the department that graduate students develop their professional aspirations. This responsibility cannot be shifted elsewhere. If there is a "culture of silence" about teaching within research departments, that problem must be addressed there directly—and not only by "generic" teacher-training programs sponsored for all graduate students, however valuable these programs may be. Depending exclusively or primarily on such programs in some ways expands rather than closes the gap between teaching and scholarship: The department trains you as a scholar, the teaching center as a teacher.

Anxiety that talking about teaching may mark one as an outsider is not restricted to graduate students; many faculty members experience it as well. There are many victims of this culture of silence, and initiatives (like the AAC project) that press departments to open such conversations to all interested colleagues—that help to authorize the consideration of these issues—contribute enormously to removing constraints that harm everyone. Discussions about teaching and professional life are not alien to the interests of graduate faculty members; rather, they are conversations waiting to happen. Developing occasions for them is a timely as well as necessary initiative.

The experiences in the AAC project suggest that graduate students—encouraged and "endorsed" by support from an Association of American Colleges or a Danforth Foundation or a Modern Language Association—are not shy in pressing for reforms within their own depart-

Graduate faculty members must be made to feel part of the solution, rather than part of the problem

ments. It is quite clear, however, that we cannot expect them to initiate change without this outside authorization. That is why AAC and other educational associations and funding agencies must play a role. In addition, because change is most likely to succeed when located within particular departments, the strong involvement of professional associations is crucial; they can be key players in guiding and creating respect for department-level efforts of this kind.

None of these recommendations can be implemented until we consider more carefully, and confront more honestly, the vexing question of how graduate students are used as teachers—in particular the question of how they are damaged, personally as well as professionally, by excessive teaching obligations. Ideally, the teaching that graduate students do should be part of their preparation for their careers, involving a sequence of carefully mentored teaching assignments. They should teach, while graduate students, in order to become good teachers. Their teaching should not be a source of cheap labor for the research university; graduate students ought not be teaching simply to relieve institutions of financial stress.

The "professionalization" of graduate education may very well be part of the process of turning graduate students from students into workers. We advise them, now, that they ought to give a conference paper by their third year and have articles published before they complete their Ph.D. They are regularly assigned teaching duties that resemble the teaching loads (two courses per semester) of faculty members. It is no wonder, then, that some graduate professors are inclined to think about their graduate students as colleagues. In this context, naming them "colleagues" may be little more than a translation into humanly acceptable terms (on the level of ideology) of changes that have been taking place over the past twenty-five years: Graduate students are now a labor force. In that regard, they join a growing contingent of part-time faculty members at all institutions, working for low wages and without the protection of academic freedom.

These observations may seem sour, but certain practices in higher education are souring, especially to graduate students. It is crucial to address these questions directly, not dance around them. Part of the reform of graduate education must include the return of graduate students to the

status of students, for whom teaching assistantships are part of a carefully planned process of preparation for the obligations of their careers, not an opportune device for balancing the next budget.

We must build support and incentives for the participation of graduate educators in these reform efforts. It has been the aim of AAC's project from the beginning not simply to provide rewarding experiences for its Teaching Fellows but to promote reform in graduate education. One thing that has become evident from this project is that the full effectiveness of the campus contact depends in large measure on the quality of continuing discussions about the experiences that the Teaching Fellows are enabled to have. This, in turn, depends on the graduate faculty's involvement and support, both at the institutional and department level. Unless these faculty members are committed to the process, the discussions lack focus and remain marginal to the substance of graduate education itself. Real incentives for graduate faculty members to participate must be developed. We must imagine ways to involve graduate educators so that they are made to feel part of the solution, rather than part of the problem.

One possible solution is to incorporate into projects like this one the topic of "graduate *teaching*" as a subject worthy of some serious attention; indeed, it may be among the most neglected topics in the available literature on higher education. At some graduate institutions, it is an omen of the worst sort for an untenured faculty member to win the award for excellent teaching in the graduate program; it seems his or her priorities are out of whack. Despite this lamentable tendency, there are many graduate faculty members who care very much about their teaching—about their work in the classroom, about guiding seminar papers and leading good discussions, and so on. Usually, they get nothing for their efforts.

Graduate teachers—at least a good number of them—might be drawn into a project that includes some of the following questions: What do we know about good graduate teaching? Who assesses it? Who rewards it? How might it differ from good undergraduate teaching? How are faculty members prepared—at any point in their lives—to become effective teachers of graduate students? Are one's accomplishments as a scholar sufficient to assure good graduate teaching? How can we identify, encourage,

and reward good teachers of graduate students—not only for their commitment to teaching graduate students well but also for their concern to help graduate students become good teachers themselves?

Many young faculty members, in fact, report—despite rumors to the contrary—that their best teacher was one of their graduate teachers. They mean by this not just that the teacher was smart and learned but that he or she worked hard as a teacher, in inspiring ways. Much might be gained by setting up occasions for good graduate teachers and good undergraduate teachers to get together to talk about good teaching at both levels. Is it the same? Is it harder at one or another level? How does someone who is good at both think about possible differences and similarities between them?

Posing and addressing questions like these would establish some connection among graduate teachers, undergraduate teachers, and graduate students around the issue of pedagogy. There also are potentially fruitful connections around curricular questions. For example, at the undergraduate level there is great concern with the "capstone course," usually defined as the last course in the major; it is a seminar meant to bring the undergraduate experience as a history or English or economics major to some kind of closure. It is retrospective, deeply introspective, and often metatheoretical. Three months later, at the graduate level—often just a few miles away and sometimes just a few classrooms away—those majors who had taken that capstone course are enrolled in the newly devised "Introduction to Graduate Study in X" course, which presumes in some measure that they haven't learned a thing.

It would be salutary to pay some attention to these two courses and to bring together the graduate and undergraduate faculty members who have developed them and the undergraduate-turned-graduate students who have taken them. Do the courses have a lot, something, anything, nothing in common? Faculty members involved in these endeavors, who obviously care about the education of their students, would thereby gain a better understanding of what each is trying to do, and connections between graduate and undergraduate education would be, at the very least, clarified.

Discussions of issues like these, which afford a place for graduate

faculty members to contribute as well as learn, are established on a common ground of concerns that can be of interest as well to graduate students. Indeed, the AAC Teaching Fellows found such discussions to be among their most valuable experiences in the project and urged that they be brought into the graduate program and offered as a formal part of the training they receive. What they wanted brought in as well was the collegial atmosphere they found in their encounters with faculty members at liberal arts colleges. They want similar relationships in their home departments; they want their research mentors to be professional mentors, too, guiding them individually through the array of responsibilities they will face.

These requests are reasonable. Graduate students really are between two worlds: They are no longer simply young apprentices in the academic discipline; they have made a choice like their graduate professors and see themselves as beginning their careers—not preparing to begin them. From the perspective of even the most dedicated and genial graduate teacher, however, requests for closer mentoring might not seem so reasonable. The place, more particularly the status, of mentoring within graduate education remains all but ignored. Even a faculty member's mentoring of research—not to mention teaching—is a neglected, usually unrewarded and marginal activity. It is pursued by the most dedicated faculty members with care and enthusiasm, but it is not much appreciated at the department and institutional levels.

There is a good deal of agreement that the work of independent scholarship (learning how to conduct one's own research and stretch the boundaries of knowledge) and autonomous teaching (knowing how to devise and conduct one's own courses) are the absolute necessities young professors must bring to their new jobs. There also is agreement that acquiring these necessary skills depends on the personal guidance one receives in writing the dissertation and in conducting one's teaching; it depends on a good mentor. However, the nature and quality of such guidance—how to do it at all and how to do it well—rarely are the subject of serious institutional reflection, and mentoring usually is a duty taken on as an overload, over and above the specified obligations of classroom teach-

What is called for is continuing dialogue and active cooperation between colleges and graduate programs

ing, service, and research. Any genuine reform of graduate education will have to include ways to promote and reward such indispensable work.

Alternative—especially collaborative—models for improving graduate preparation must be developed. It is quite evident by now that different kinds of colleges expect, or at least hope, that new faculty members will arrive fully prepared to "hit the ground running," already knowing all that they will need to know about being a teacher at that type of institution. Graduate schools, obviously, can't by themselves prepare every Ph.D. for every possible job. Indeed, most of the college faculty members in this project noted that even the graduate programs that attend most fully to preparing their students to teach still had in mind that they would "of course" have careers at other graduate institutions—at large universities with large departments in which one might reasonably expect to teach in areas of specialization and to proceed in one's career as one's graduate mentors have done. Such narrowness led one college participant to resurrect William Stringellow's proposal that liberal arts colleges develop their own graduate schools to educate their teachers.

In the absence of that (unlikely) event, what is called for is continuing dialogue and active cooperation between colleges and graduate programs. College faculty members generally acknowledge that graduate programs need both direction and help from the institutions their graduates will go on to serve. Many consider informing and guiding graduate students about what awaits them—the many possibilities they might encounter, depending on where they are hired—a crucial duty that everyone in the profession should assume.

Most faculty members in this project mentioned the value—for some, the necessity—of mentoring relationships outside the graduate institution. They suggested several possibilities: For example, one proposed a "semester loan program" in which a graduate student would spend an entire semester at a nearby college; another recommended graduate student teaching fellowships that would pay graduate students to teach at the college under the guidance of college faculty members.

Whatever form these exchange programs might take, there obviously is a need and an occasion to restore programs like the Woodrow

Wilson Internships, which in the late 1960s and early 1970s placed and supported graduate students in teaching positions at undergraduate institutions, particularly historically black colleges and universities. Many graduate students who had such an experience found themselves transformed, developing deep commitments to teaching and a more balanced appreciation of the work of their careers and their lives. Restoring this kind of program, which could include support not just for teaching but for research and writing during the internship, would contribute significantly to the college and immeasurably to the intern. It would allow him or her to envision the shape of a career in an environment that provides exposure to a more encompassing set of responsibilities and opportunities.

More localized arrangements—what Guilford's Rebecca Gibson terms an informal network with colleges in the vicinity—also are needed. By connecting graduate programs to a variety of undergraduate institutions in close proximity, the long commutes that marked the AAC project could be avoided. A cooperative program will work best when the institutions are readily accessible to one another; it may not work at all, despite the good intentions of those involved, when they are far apart. A substantial commute (anything over an hour) requires a good deal of planning and a willingness—especially on the part of the graduate student—to sacrifice a full day. A car is obviously necessary, as are full days free; so too is child care for students with children. There can be no casual, spontaneous visits, and even the most informal meeting requires much in the way of advanced planning.

For this reason alone, every effort should be made to pair research universities and colleges that are located as near to one another as possible. Graduate students need the chance to meet with their mentors as often, as conveniently, and as spontaneously as possible. Where liberal arts colleges are in fact nearby, they would stand as ideal candidates for these pairings. In any case, however, it is desirable to include other kinds of institutions—so long as they are willing to provide Teaching Fellows with the range of experiences the project requires and so long as their commitment to undergraduate teaching remains a central focus of the program.

In expanding the range of participating undergraduate institutions,

Those concerned about undergraduate teaching have not just a legitimate interest but a right and duty to act to change existing patterns of graduate training

a much more comprehensive undertaking becomes possible. I suggested earlier that those concerned about undergraduate teaching have not just a legitimate interest but a right and duty to act to change existing patterns of graduate training. To help initiate such change, faculty members and administrators committed to the importance of teaching and to the undergraduate mission of their institutions must recognize themselves as a "class" with shared interests and goals. Participation in changing graduate education may not have an immediate or direct payoff: What faculty members at Connecticut College (and Providence College, Salve Regina College, Wheaton College, the University of Rhode Island, and so on) can do to influence graduate studies at Brown may only occasionally result in identifiable benefit to them and their institutions; few students receiving Ph.D.s from Brown may come to teach at their schools. But a national effort, influencing graduate programs in all areas of the country, will benefit everyone.

It is difficult even to imagine such an effort; it seems arrogant, intrusive, and perhaps somewhat rude to envision teaching institutions even volunteering, much less demanding, a voice and a role in the forming of graduate students' preparation for undergraduate teaching. It would be comparable to hospitals asking to shape medical education, legal institutions demanding and facilitating changes in legal education, businesses insisting that MBA programs listen and respond to their declared needs and requirements. Of course, this is precisely what medical, legal, and business institutions do, and they do it for a very good reason: It makes their work better. Colleges and universities committed to liberal education must take the same kind of initiative.

To do so will require a national effort created and supported by a coalition of colleges and universities, education associations, professional associations, and funding agencies to form collaborative relationships between research universities and nearby colleges. The model developed by the AAC project—focusing on the interaction of graduate students with mentoring college faculty members and including opportunities to experience and reflect on academic "cultures" different from those at research universities—provides a point of departure for developing this more com-

prehensive initiative. An expanded, but more "local," version of the original project would even make it possible to introduce graduate students to several *different* types of undergraduate institutions, enhancing even further their awareness of and preparation for different career possibilities.

Much will depend on recruiting and supporting interested faculty members who are willing to serve as mentors and who are positioned to provide for the Teaching Fellows a full range of experiences on their campus. It seems quite clear, however—especially from conversations with faculty members from the participating liberal arts colleges—that resources are out there, ready to be called to this new sense of professional contribution.

In advancing efforts to realize and expand the aims of the original project, it would be helpful to sponsor a series of institutes—perhaps held during the summer—that bring together graduate faculty members, faculty members at undergraduate institutions, and graduate students to explore the need for change and envision mechanisms for achieving it. Such institutes should be multidisciplinary, since the need for reform crosses all disciplinary boundaries. They also should include both public and private graduate institutions and all different types of teaching institutions.

The issues and concerns that have emerged from AAC's project can serve as topics to initiate these discussions, but it would be the purpose of such institutes to raise further questions and explore additional solutions. Representatives from the universities and colleges active in the AAC project should be called upon to participate in these institutes, offering perspectives based on their experiences over the past two years. Other participants could be drawn from universities and colleges in close proximity to one another—proposing themselves as teams and committed to implementing a cooperative program that they develop during the institute. The aim of these institutes would be to initiate long-term planning on a national level. Participating faculty members and students would seek to envision forms of cooperation and means of mutual support that bring about a more effective and more encompassing graduate training, one that truly begins faculty development in graduate school.

CONCLUSION

In undertaking its project on the Professional Responsibilities of College Teachers, AAC has tried to raise important questions about graduate preparation and provide viable alternatives to current practices. Drawing on the college faculty members themselves and inviting the active participation of graduate students and their mentors, the project points the way to more collaborative as well as more comprehensive models for preparing the next generation of the professoriat. This movement toward reform must now itself become more collaborative and comprehensive. Leaders of professional and education associations and program officers of funding agencies must become involved; teachers and administrators at every kind of college and university must become involved; faculty members and students in all disciplines must become involved. Institutes and conferences bringing together all of these concerned parties in the higher education community need to be sponsored, to advance significant reform in the following areas:

- reshaping the graduate curriculum to make it more inclusive, to integrate considerations of teaching and other professional responsibilities
- improving the kind and range of experiences that graduate students are afforded as they prepare for their careers, including the development of a carefully planned progression of teaching assignments under the guidance of a faculty mentor
- changing the academic reward system to support—in every way—the work of those faculty members at graduate and undergraduate institutions who assume a primary role in the preparation of graduate students
- developing internship and exchange programs to provide for graduate students mentored experiences as teachers and scholars at institutions committed to liberal education.

By promoting collaborative efforts to realize these aims, higher education can continue the process of reform that so many educators have been demanding for so long. The AAC project has made clear that these

calls for change have been heard and can be answered. Now it is time for a more comprehensive response, one that embraces a wider range of institutions and disciplines and brings together faculty members, graduate students, administrators, and educational leaders in the spirit of cooperation that has marked this first, crucial step toward reform.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A project like the one described in this monograph can succeed only through the dedication of many individuals—far too numerous to mention by name here. Above all, the faculty members and graduate students who participated with such enthusiasm deserve the credit for the project's success. I want to extend special thanks to Thomas Jeavons, until recently associate director of programs at AAC (now director of the Center for Philanthropy and Nonprofit Leadership and a professor in the School of Public Administration at Grand Valley State University), who directed the project; to Sam Schuman and Kathrynn Adams, who coordinated it at Guilford College; and to Garrett Green, their counterpart at Connecticut College. Leigh DeNeef, coordinator at Duke University, offered guidance and unfailing moral support throughout. The late Harriet Sheridan, who coordinated the project at Brown University, remains forever a source of inspiration to those touched by her lifetime's commitment to college teaching; all of higher education is indebted to her leadership.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

JAMES SLEVIN served as the consultant/evaluator of AAC's project, Preparing Graduate Students for the Professional Responsibilities of College Teachers. He is a professor of English at Georgetown University, where he served for six years as department chair and now serves as director of graduate studies. Since 1987 he has held the John S. Knight Visiting Professorship at Cornell University, where he conducts graduate training and faculty development programs each summer. He was a Danforth Fellow from 1967–1975 and a Woodrow Wilson Intern from 1967–1971. He has published extensively on the issue of reforming graduate education.

ASSOCIATION
of AMERICAN
COLLEGES

1818 R Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.
20009

The Association of American Colleges is the only institutional-membership higher education association whose primary mission is promoting liberal education. AAC strives to strengthen undergraduate curricula and revitalize classroom teaching and learning through research and development projects, publications, national and regional meetings and workshops, and multi-campus partnerships and networks.

Founded in 1915, AAC comprises more than 650 public and private colleges and universities of all types and sizes. AAC's activities build bridges across disciplines and forge links between administrators, academic leaders, and faculty members. By creating a national community of purposes among institutions that share a concern for how undergraduates are taught and what they learn, AAC influences higher education's responses to the full range of today's academic challenges.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE